-8-

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on January 31, 2005 in which all of pending claims 1-39 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 2, 19 and 35 are canceled. Claims 1, 3, 4, 13-15, 18, 20, 21, 27-31, 34, and 36-39 are amended. Claims 1, 3-18, 20-34, and 36-39 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

In section 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 18 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Boozer et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0205355 A1). With this amendment, independent claims 1, 18 and 34 are amended to include the limitations of original claims 2, 19 and 35, respectively. Independent claim 1 recites a method of providing Resource-Event-Agent (REA) model based security. As amended, the method includes the steps of "identifying an association between a first object and a second object in an REA model," and "creating an association class object for the association between the first object and the second object, the association class object having properties defining security between the first object and the second object." Independent claim 18 recites a computer readable medium with the same limitations. Independent claim 34 recites a system for providing security which includes similar limitations. The system includes "a Resource-Event-Agent (REA) model configured to implement a first object, a second object, and an association between the first object and the second object." As amended, the system also includes "a security model configured to implement an association class object for the association between the first object and the second object in the REA model, such that properties of the association class object define security between the first object and the second object."

In support of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Office Action stated that Boozer et al. (hereafter Boozer) teach a method/system/computer readable medium for providing Resource-Even-Agent (REA) model based security. More specifically, the Office Action states that Boozer teaches the steps of identifying an association between a first object and a second object in an REA model, and creating an association class for the association between the first object and the second object, with the association class defining security between the first object and the second object.

-9-

This interpretation of Boozer is respectfully traversed. Boozer does not disclose REA models or REA model based security. Since Boozer does not disclose REA model based security, it follows that it does not teach the step (or related models) of "identifying an association between a first object and a second object in an REA model." Further, since the claims require that the identified association be between first and second objects in an REA model, Boozer also does not disclose the step of "creating an association class object for the association between the first object and the second object, the association class object having properties defining security between the first object and the second object."

It is noted that in section 4 of the Office Action, originally filed dependent claims 2-17, 19-33 and 35-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boozer in view of Colburn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,173,404). Since independent claims 1, 18 and 34 are amended to include the limitations of now canceled dependent claims 2, 19 and 35, respectively, the basis of rejection of these claims in section 4 of the Office Action is applied to the independent claims for analysis purposes.

In section 4, in discussing the basis of rejection of claims 2, 19 and 35, the Office Action stated that Boozer does not teach creating an association class object having properties, with the properties of the association class object defining security between the first object and the second object. The Office Action instead recites col. 6, lines 42-52 of Colburn et al. (hereafter Colburn) for providing this teaching. However, in view of the above comments regarding the fact that Boozer does not disclose REA models or REA model based security, it is respectfully submitted that the REA model related aspects of the above-discussed claim limitations must also be taught by Colburn to support the rejection of independent claims 1, 18 and 34. Since Colburn does not disclose REA models or REA model based security, it is respectfully submitted that a combination of Boozer and Colburn does not render independent claims 1, 18 and 34 obvious. This combination of references does not teach the steps of "identifying an association between a first object and a second object in an REA model," and "creating an association class object for the association between the first object and the second object, the association class object having properties defining security between the first object and the second object." Consequently, it is

-10-

respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 18 and 34 are in allowable form, along with dependent claims 3-17, 20-33, and 36-39. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of all pending claims be withdrawn.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: _____
   John D. Veldhuis-Kroeze, Reg. No. 38,354
   Suite 1600 - International Centre
   900 Second Avenue South
   Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
   Phone: (612) 334-3222
   Fax: (612) 334-3312

JVK/jmc